Mission impossible: why crisis management missions do not increase the visibility of the European Union

Anderson, Stephanie B.

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Arbeitspapier / working paper

WORKING PAPER KFG The Transformative Power of Europe

Mission Impossible

Why Crisis Management Missions Do Not Increase the Visibility of the European Union

Stephanie B. Anderson

No. 58 | December 2013

Freie Universität Berlin

KFG Working Paper Series

Edited by the *Kolleg-Forschergruppe* "The Transformative Power of Europe"

The KFG Working Paper Series serves to disseminate the research results of the Kolleg-Forschergruppe by making them available to a broader public. It means to enhance academic exchange as well as to strengthen and broaden existing basic research on internal and external diffusion processes in Europe and the European Union.

All KFG Working Papers are available on the KFG website at www.transformeurope.eu or can be ordered in print via email to transform-europe@fu-berlin.de.

Editorial assistance and production: André Berberich and Filip Bubenheimer

Anderson, Stephanie B. 2013: Mission Impossible: Why Crisis Management Missions Do Not Increase the Visibility of the European Union, KFG Working Paper Series, No. 58, December 2013, Kolleg-Forschergruppe (KFG) "The Transformative Power of Europe", Freie Universität Berlin.

ISSN 1868-6834 (Print)
ISSN 1868-7601 (Internet)

This publication has been funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG).

Freie Universität Berlin
Kolleg-Forschergruppe
"The Transformative Power of Europe:
The European Union and the Diffusion of Ideas"
Ihnestr. 26
14195 Berlin
Germany
Phone: +49 (0)30- 838 57033
Fax: +49 (0)30- 838 57096
transform-europe@fu-berlin.de
www.transformeurope.eu

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft DFG

Mission Impossible

Why Crisis Management Missions Do Not Increase the Visibility of the European Union

Stephanie B. Anderson

Abstract

The European Union's (EU) Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and its accompanying Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP) missions are tools used to increase the international profile of the EU. Using three different databases, this study features a content analysis that evaluates how much and what kind of media coverage CSDP missions receive. In general, the news coverage is positive, but limited. This article argues that the problem is structural: the very nature of the missions themselves, whether EU or NATO, makes them poor vehicles for EU promotion for political, institutional, and logistical reasons. By definition, they are conducted in the middle of crises, making news coverage politically sensitive. The very act of reporting could undermine the mission. Institutionally, all CSDP missions are intergovernmental; therefore, the member states control the coverage. Logistically, the missions are usually located in remote, undeveloped parts of the world, making it difficult and expensive for European and international journalists to cover. Moreover, these regions in crisis seldom have a thriving, local free press. The author concludes that although a mission may do good, CSDP missions cannot fulfill their primary political function of raising the profile of the EU.

The Author

Stephanie B. Anderson B.S.F.S. (Georgetown), M.Sc. (Econ), Ph.D. (*Cantab.*) is associate professor of political science and adjunct professor of international studies and gender and women's studies at the University of Wyoming. More recently, she was a senior fellow at the Free University of Berlin researching EU security and defence policy, identity-formation, and crisis management and the scholar-in-residence at the EU Centre in Singapore. Her book, *Crafting EU Security Policy: In Pursuit of a European Identity* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2008) is based on research undertaken as a Senior Fulbright Research Scholar at the German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP). Her first Fulbright was as a Senior Scholar in the Graduate School of International Studies at Sogang University in Seoul, Korea. She has also published in several journals and edited volumes including *Armed Forces and Society* and *European Foreign Affairs Review*. Contact: redhead@uwyo.edu

Contents

1. Introduction

The European Union (EU) has initiated more than 25 crisis management missions around the world since 2003. United Nations (UN) Secretary General Ban Ki-moon stated that "the United Nations and the European Union have been maintaining a special partnership", and expressed his "deep admiration and appreciation of what the European Union has been doing in terms of peace and prosperity as well as the protection and enhancement of human rights, climate change and the fight against terrorism" (Spokesperson of the Secretary General, High Representative for CFSP 2007). In a response to the question "who will die for Europe", German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer replied, "European soldiers are facing danger in Afghanistan, Bosnia and Kosovo. (…) They are there as members of national contingents, but they are serving a wider interest - Europe's. There is a soul, (…) [t]here is a spirit. And people die for Europe, and have died" (Bernstein 2005). Nevertheless, these missions garner so little media coverage that increasing their visibility will be an agenda item for the European Council in December 2013, and not for the first time.

Commission spokeswoman Pia Arkenhilde explained,

> *it's obvious that visibility is part of being effective. It's important for the recipients of the aid to know who they are dealing with and for the European tax payer, the donors of the aid, to see the actions on the ground, in terms of their future engagement (Rettman 2010).*

Is there anything the EU can do to increase the visibility of CSDP missions? Very little. The very nature of the missions, whether the sponsoring organization is the EU or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), limits the use of crisis management missions as tools of self-promotion. Even when CSDP missions are successful, their attributes make EU publicity extremely difficult. First, politically, they are almost always the result of closed-door negotiations, and, therefore, do not lend themselves to publicity. Since the member states are the ones risking blood and treasure, that is their soldiers and their tax revenues, contributing member state governments take all the credit when the mission is a success and blame the EU when there is a problem. Logistically, CSDP missions are usually located in remote, undeveloped parts of the world, often without a thriving, local free press, making it difficult and expensive for European and international journalists to cover. However, the lack of press coverage may increase the potential success of the mission by playing a low profile and giving a greater impression of local ownership to the crisis management. Although a mission may do good, CSDP missions cannot fulfill their primary political function of raising the profile of the EU.

The first section of the paper explains the political premise of using CSDP missions to showcase the EU. Next, using data from a quantitative content analysis, the author demonstrates that this policy disappoints; in general, CSDP missions gather very little news coverage and do not succeed in raising the Union's profile. However, a secondary investigation into comparator missions in NATO demonstrates that the problem is not the EU's alone. The paper then uses a qualitative analysis to explain how the very nature of CSDP missions undermines their use as a political promotion tool.

2. Visibility and the CSDP: Increasing the EU's International Prestige and Support Among its Citizens[1]

The EU's foreign and security policy is supposed to increase the profile of the EU both at home and abroad. The 1993 Maastricht Treaty on European Union stated that one of the main goals of the newly established CFSP was to "assert its identity on the international scene". This goal was reiterated in the Saint-Mâlo Declaration in December 1998, which led to the formation of the subsequent European Security and Defense Policy[2] "in order that Europe c[ould] make its voice heard in world affairs" (Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the UK 1998). According to the 2003 Concept for EU Monitoring Missions, one of the "basic principles" was to "enhance EU visibility" (Council of the European Union 2003). In 2010, the European External Action Service (EEAS) was established with the same goal in mind: to "increase the Union's political and economic influence in the world" (Council of the European Union 2010).

Many member states have called for measures to increase press coverage of the CSDP as a way of gaining international respect and internal public support for the European project. Luxembourg, which held the EU presidency during the first half of 2005, made the issue of ESDP promotion a main talking point. Although lengthy, this quotation is instructive.

> *To achieve the goal of an improved and enhanced communication strategy, there is no secret: explain, popularize, envelop it in common language at the same time as debating its objectives and concepts in order to spread it among the public. In most of the European societies, where armed conflicts have a bad reputation and where the horrors of war are still profoundly anchored, speaking about security and defence often awakens suspicion and provokes a sense of unease which it is difficult to get rid of. Nonetheless, stereotypes and misleading sentiments tend to stay on forever.* ***Therefore, in order to convince, the European Union and the Member States have to become even more active and have to develop a true communication strategy on ESDP. The objective of this strategy should be to rally public opinion around a policy and to legitimate the ESDP by a strong parliamentary and popular support*** *[sic, but emphasis added] (Luxembourg Presidency of the Council of the European Union 2005).*

Academic research supports the claims made above: media coverage, provided it is both visible and consistent, can change public opinion regarding the EU (de Vreese/Boomgaarden 2006 : 419).

In April 2006, the Western European Union (WEU) Assembly, comprised of members of the national parliaments, sponsored a report that determined that neither the media nor the people were paying enough attention. The rapporteur concluded, "the EU's role in the security of the region [during the ALTHEA Mission to Bosnia] had not contributed as much as might be *hoped* towards enhancing the way in which the ESDP was perceived by the public at large [emphasis added]" (Assembly of the Western European Union 2006a). Therefore, "tangible results" needed to be made "clearer and more accessible to the public" (Assembly of the Western European Union 2006b). Just a few weeks later, the UK Parliament hosted a two-day seminar on "Building a secure Europe in a better world: Parliamentary responsibility and action in shaping public opinion on security and defence."

1 For a more in-depth analysis of CSDP role in identity or nation building in the EU, see Anderson (2008).

2 The Lisbon Treaty later changed the name of the policy to the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP).

Decision-makers continued to remark on the limited media coverage and public support of CSDP mission in the 2008 Report on the Implementation of the European Security Strategy – Providing Security in a Changing World:

> *Maintaining public support for our global engagement is fundamental. In modern democracies, where media and public opinion are crucial to shaping policy, popular commitment is essential to sustaining our commitments abroad. We deploy police, judicial experts and soldiers in unstable zones around the world. There is an onus on governments, parliaments and EU institutions to communicate how this contributes to security at home (Council of the European Union 2008: 12).*

Within the Council's Political and Security Committee (PSC), other member states have continued to voice their concern over lack of visibility regarding EU actions overseas. In a non-public white paper, sponsored by Greece in 2010, to the PSC titled "Enhancing the EU's public diplomacy: Better visibility and efficiency in EU's foreign actions *The role of the E.E.A.S. and of the PSC*" the Greek government called upon the EEAS to take measures to increase the visibility of the EU on the world stage declaring "the perception of the EU by the local population and appreciation of its role [...] is not proportionate to the huge political and financial capital provided by the EU."[3] Both the European Councils of December 2012 and December 2013 have underlined the importance of increasing the visibility of the CSDP (European Council 2012: 10).[4]

3. The Media Coverage of CSDP Missions: Little Mention and Little Debate

In general, all the CSDP missions have been successful insofar as they have accomplished their mission, had minimal loss of life, and cost relatively little. Certainly, there have been some mildly embarrassing stories, for example, when Iraqis participating in EULEX Iraq, brought to the Netherlands for judicial training, snuck out to seek asylum in Sweden,[5] but, not only have been no Srebrenicas[6], there have been almost no cases of misbehaving military or civilian workers. As Luc Frieden, Luxembourg minister and President-in-office of the Council explained, "European soldiers in the world are like our visiting card" (as cited in Agence Europe 2005: 4). Therefore, the Council adopted standards of behavior to be applied to all categories of personnel involved in ESDP operations. Any violation of human rights is to be reported, and all are to respect the ethnic, religious and cultural diversity of the local population. Drug use and sexual exploitation are forbidden: "It is a code of conduct so that EU soldiers are worthy representatives of the EU in difficult missions throughout the world" (as cited in Agence Europe 2005: 4). This record is a significant accomplishment, and yet, the media have mostly ignored the CSDP missions.

3 An internal EU document cited by Paul Sturm (2010: 1).

4 Increasing visibility for the CSDP has also been made an agenda item for the future European Council in December 2013.

5 Interview with Dutch official from the Permanent Mission of the Netherlands to the European Union, 8 November 2005, Brussels, Belgium.

6 The July 1995 Srebrenica massacre or genocide during the Bosnian war refers to the killing of 8,000 Bosniaks or Bosnian Muslims in an enclave designated a "safe area" under UN protection. The 400 Dutch peacekeepers on the ground were unable to prevent the massacre.

To give an idea of how many hits a term can get using Google News archives, that is, searching 25,000 global news sources for the entirety of its archives from 2004 onwards, at one end of the spectrum is U.S. President Barack Obama with 48,800,000 hits. The EU gets 7,250,000 hits. The Euro crisis gathers 1,700,000 hits. German Chancellor Angela Merkel gets 1,480,000 hits. European Commission president Jose Manuel Barroso has 168,000. Compared to other general search terms regarding European security, anything involving CSDP missions receives a fraction of the news attention. NATO gathers 6,770,000 hits. Former High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy, Javier Solana garners 91,500 hits and his successor, Catherine Ashton, 85,300. The term "EU crisis management mission" gets 4,280 hits. The term "CFSP" receives 686 hits and the term "CSDP" gets 158 hits. [7] These numbers may be artificially low because they are acronyms. Adding all the hits in Google News archives for all the CSDP missions results in a total number of 24,975 hits. In percentages, using the largest possible numbers, that is the almost 25,000 total hits for all CSDP missions, the missions garnered 0.35 per cent of the media attention that the EU and NATO received, and about 15 per cent of the attention that the CFSP High Representative (combining their totals) received during the same time period. One NATO mission, ISAF (Afghanistan), received 158,000 hits, or more than six times the news coverage for all the CSDP missions combined. Nevertheless, most NATO missions also receive little coverage. The problem lies in the nature of the missions: they are poor vehicles for self-promotion.

3.1 Methodology: Assessing the Media Coverage of CSDP Missions

Just how much media coverage have the CSDP missions garnered? In a content analysis, in 2011, the author and her research assistant placed the official names of every CSDP mission into three separate databases: Lexis/Nexis Academic (Lexis); World News Connection (WNC), formerly the Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS); and the Google News archive. Lexis/Nexis has a database of over 10,000 global news sources.[8] WNC, operated by the Open Source Center, an agency of the U.S. government, has thousands of non-U.S. media translated into English, with a particular emphasis on local media coverage.[9] Google News covers more than 25,000 news sources worldwide (Cohen 2009). By using three different databases, the researchers were able to triangulate their findings. Both the author and her assistant went over the articles to ensure proper and consistent coding.

Due to language barriers, this research project only utilized articles in English or translated into English. Both Lexis and WNC databases have extensive archives of English-language articles, translated and otherwise. Despite this limitation, the search yielded thousands of newspaper articles, press releases, broadcast transcripts, and various opinion pieces from news sources around the world. In order to ensure the analysis of only relevant articles, that is on the specific CSDP mission in question as opposed to, for example, piracy

7 On 3 October 2013, the author placed these terms into Google News archives (2004 to present) to get the widest possible number of hits.

8 http://www.lexisnexis.com/en-us/products/lexisnexis-academic.page. LexisNexis covers both English and non-English major world publications plus wire services, broadcast transcripts, magazines, journals, and newsletters.

9 For more information, see http://wnc.fedworld.gov/description.html.

off the coast of Somalia in general, all missions search terms included only the official mission name (e.g. EULEX Kosovo, EUFOR Congo) and date restrictions when necessary (e.g. the multiple EUPOL missions in Congo). Although some relevant articles might have been missed using this tactic, most articles on CSDP missions do mention the mission by name. Moreover, the point of the study was to discover how often the EU's missions were highlighted as opposed to missions where the member state was highlighted. So as to catch any reference to a specific mission and in order to count as many relevant results as possible, we looked for the specific terms throughout the article, as opposed to searching within the headline and lead. The content analysis necessarily excluded press selections, governmental journals and reports, and industry reports due to time constraints and relevance to search terms and parameters.

In order to conduct a content analysis, such a large volume of articles, more than 15,000 in the LexisNexis and World News Connection databases, necessitated the use of random sampling for the various missions. The analytical criteria for missions with a high volume (over 150) of articles called for a sampling of 100 articles, regardless of the sample size. The criteria also stressed the need to randomly select articles based on a logical, linear basis. For example, the EUFOR Althea mission in the WNC search yielded 266 hits, so every second article comprised the random sample for the content analysis (articles 2, 4, 6, etc.). Missions with fewer that 150 hits necessitated a content analysis of all available articles so as to ensure the best possible outcome for statistical analysis. Since there is no feasible way to exclude the irrelevant types of publications within the search parameters in the respective search engines, whenever press selections or other similarly excluded types of articles appeared in the results, the next possible relevant article was analyzed and the pattern of randomly selecting articles resumed at the predetermined interval.

Slight differences in the two search engines necessitated slightly different search methods on occasion. For example, the WNC database only goes back ten years, thus explaining the lack of articles for the European Community/Union Monitoring Mission (ECMM/EUMM), the Balkans monitoring mission. Furthermore, Lexis allowed for sorting of the articles by date, starting with the earliest available date. WNC sorted articles by date but only allowed for sorting starting with the latest date. While not ideal, the content analysis of the WNC articles for each mission began with the most recent articles and progressed to the earliest. Analysis from Lexis sources began with the earliest possible articles and progressed from there. With regard to Lexis/Nexis, we did not specify a region so as to cast the net as wide as possible. We chose to search for the words as natural language. Whereas LexisNexis will display no number of hits larger than 3,000, the other databases had no such restrictions.

Coding for each article consisted of eleven different variables: date, official mission name, perspective, coverage tone, country of origin for the publication, length of the article (number of sentences), length of the actual coverage on the mission (number of sentences), word count, search engine utilized, article type (news, analysis, opinion, or press release), and publication. WNC searches included inflated word counts due to the presence of reprinted leads, and expansive tags and search terms. In order to remain consistent, all numbers for the word count variable are reproduced as given by the respective search engines. Identifying information present in each article allowed for straightforward coding for other variables (date, country of origin, length of articles, length on action, search engine, and publications). The researchers manually counted the sentences for the length of the article and length on the action.

The variables of coverage tone, article type, and perspective required strict coding criteria due to the subjective nature of the variables. Coverage tone of the articles consisted of either positive or negative coding. Positive articles reported on the progress of the respective missions, analyzed the process and outcomes of the missions, or characterized the missions in any sort of positive or neutral way. In other words, the results are skewed towards the positive. Negative articles focused almost entirely on mission setbacks. Mission deaths, local population casualties due to the mission presence, serious administrative obstacles (on the EU, international, and national levels), and/or tactical and strategic obstacles were the indicators for negative coverage tone. The strict criteria for coding articles as negative were necessary in order to properly classify articles in the instance where the majority of the coverage remained positive or neutral.

Article type consisted of four categories: news, analysis, opinion, and press releases. In most cases, the identifying information in the article identified the proper article type. When the publisher or search engine failed to provide the information within the article, a thorough reading of the articles coupled with comparison to previously categorized articles provided sufficient information to determine the correct article type.

Perspective of the article proved to be the most difficult to code. Perspective consisted of three different categories: national, international, or European. Due to perspective overlap, in particular between the European and international perspectives, the analytical criteria needed to be thorough. For an article to be considered European in perspective, the majority of the article had to report on the significance of the mission with regard to the EU, issues regarding European coordination and decision-making, or states' role both with and within the EU or Europe as a whole. For an article to be considered international in perspective, the article needed to cover the larger geopolitical ramifications of the respective missions (namely with regard to the UN, NATO, or other international organizations; also, the larger realms of international or regional security), or relations of the country in which the mission was taking place with the number of applicable international institutions or states. For an article to be considered national in perspective, it needed primarily to cover individual states' experiences with the missions, namely in the form of budgetary and operational concerns and progress. Undoubtedly, some articles could be classified as international or European, or national or European, but the criteria served to eliminate as much ambiguity as possible.

3.2 Content Analysis Data

MISSION	LEXIS NEXIS	WORLD NEWS CONNECTION	GOOGLE NEWS Archives
EUTM Somalia	72	18	142
EUNAVFOR Somalia (Atalanta)	336	482	1,720
EUNAVCO Somalia	4	0	8
EUMM Georgia	518	106	577
EULEX Kosovo	3,000+	2,728	8,790
EU SSR Guinea-Bissau	16	11	12
EUFOR TCHAD Chad	1,494	367	1,220
EUPOL Afghanistan	400	69	1,060
EUPOL Congo	104	8	210
EUFOR RD Congo	522	103	1,130
EUPT Kosovo	27	9	40
EUPAT Macedonia	7	3	8
EUPOL COPPS Palestinian territories	124	13	64
EUBAM Ukraine-Moldova	179	36	27
EUBAM Rafah	95	17	231
AMM Aceh	658	107	935
Support to AMIS Sudan	122	64	2,580
EUJUST LEX Iraq	86	11	52
EUSEC Congo	74	10	263
EUPOL Kinshasa Congo	50	4	124
EUFOR Althea Bosnia	275	266	4,430
EUPOL Proxima Macedonia	16	191	45
ARTEMIS Congo	459	82	380
CONCORDIA Macedonia	327	205	569
EUPM Bosnia	890	308	355
ECMM/EUMM Balkans	3	1	3
TOTAL	9,858+	5,219	24,975

In raw figures, the CSDP missions got very little play in traditional media outlets such as newspapers, radio, and television. Of all the missions, only EULEX Kosovo had hit number in the thousands in all three databases. Only eight missions out of 26 had hits in the hundreds in all three databases.

Of the 3010 articles analyzed, only 89 were analysis (3 percent), 200 were press releases (6 percent), 65 were opinion pieces (2 percent), three were blogs and the rest was news (88 percent). There were no editorials. 21 percent were coded as European in perspective (626/3,010), 52 percent (1,564/3,010) were international in their coverage of the missions, and 27 percent (820/3,010) took a national perspective. Average

length on the missions themselves was 14.3 lines, but only 715 out of the 3,010 articles (24 percent) had more than ten lines on the missions themselves. In terms of words, only 233/3,010 or 8 percent of articles that mentioned the missions at all were over 1,000 words in length. In other words, in-depth discussion or analysis of the missions themselves was extremely limited.

France and Belgium led the pack both in terms of total number of articles about these missions and the average number of articles for each mission. In terms of article length, Germany was the lead country with Denmark and Belgium close behind.

Turning to the tone of coverage, for most countries the tone was overwhelmingly positive. Denmark was the exception, but there were so few articles that this statistic could be an anomaly. For all of the other countries, coverage was at least 70 percent positive and was above 90 percent positive for most of the countries. Germany had the lowest percentage of positive articles (among countries with a sufficiently large enough number of articles to analyze) with 71.7 percent with Spain, U.K., France, Ireland, and Austria having positive coverage in the 80 percent range.

Regarding the missions, the five missions that received the most press coverage from EU countries were:

Artemis Congo
EUfor Congo
EUfor Tchad
EUNAVfor Atalanta
EUPOL Afghanistan

Each of these missions had over a hundred articles written about them. Most of the coverage of these missions was overwhelmingly positive. A few missions had coverage that ranged in the 70 percent positive range, which is low considering that the average coverage for the missions was 93 percent positive. Some of the other missions, especially those about which only a few articles were written, had 100 percent positive coverage. Most of the other missions had 90 percent positive coverage or more. The four missions that might constitute “problem” missions are those with coverage in the 70 percent range:

EUFOR Tchad
EULEX Kosovo
EUNAFOR Atalanta
EUPOL Afghanistan

The coverage of these missions was statistically much lower than the others, especially considering that the average coverage was 93 percent positive. Nevertheless, the coverage was still overwhelmingly positive. This figure could indicate massive approval of the missions as well little debate or little interest. In general, the missions with the most press coverage also got the most negative coverage. In other words, no news is good news, but also, good news is no news.

Is the poor media coverage due to a deficiency on the EU side or from a structural problem that affects international organizations sponsoring crisis management issues in general? NATO makes an excellent comparator because both the EU and NATO have similar membership, 21 European countries are members of both organizations, and because they have both participated in similar missions in similar areas, for example in former Yugoslavia and off the Horn of Africa.

Most comparator missions in NATO received similar numbers in the hundreds as the EU missions, with the exceptions of the major military intervention in Afghanistan that numbered in the thousands in all three databases, and had numbers in five or six figures. The similar numbers would indicate that the problem lies not with the EU, but with the missions themselves.

COMPARATOR NATO OPERATIONS	**LEXIS NEXIS**	**WORLD NEWS CONNECTION**	**GOOGLE NEWS Archives**
ISAF (Afghanistan)	3,000+	9,596	158,000
"Essential Harvest" (in Macedonia)	1,536	96	722
"Amber Fox"	323	100	114
"Allied Harmony"	47	100	94
"Allied Protector"	207	94	74
Pakistan earthquake relief	994	193	1,140
"Active Endeavour" (detecting and deterring terrorist activity in the Mediterranean)	170	91	513
KFOR NATO (Kosovo)	997	2,569	21,300
"Unified Protector" NATO (Libya)	1,000	127	2,830
NTM-I (Iraq)	202	10	198
"Eagle Assist"	53	0	31
Ocean Shield (Piracy off the Horn of Africa)	999	87	1,550

4. Why CSDP Missions are Poor Vehicles for EU Promotion

Interviews with EU officials and press officers support these findings. None were surprised at the low coverage. CSDP missions are poor vehicles for EU promotion because the very nature of CSDP missions hinders press coverage for political, institutional, and logistical reasons. In other words, CSDP missions are politically sensitive, making news coverage imprudent or even impossible. The member states, that take the risk to send soldiers, also take the lion's share of credit when the mission is successful and blame the EU when there is a problem. Finally, the missions' very location makes it difficult for journalists to cover, even when a crisis management mission is successful.

The fact that CSDP missions are the product of secret, multilateral negotiations dealing with politically sensitive crises means that the very construction of press releases and statements is fraught with danger as the wrong word could jeopardize the mission itself. First, they often begin as secret negotiations among diplomats behind closed doors. Therefore, there can be no build up in the press from the EU side. Moreover, peace building is more likely to succeed if the facilitator has a low profile. The protagonists will be more likely to participate in a conference if they get the credit for the peace agreement rather than the EU or another international organization, non-governmental organization or other intermediary. In other words, EU promotion could endanger the mission. Such is the case for any crisis management mission: whether the UN, the EU, or NATO, the interlocutor must be discreet.

Institutionally, once the situation is brought to the attention of EU member states, new closed-door negotiations begin to win the necessary support of the 27. With unanimity the standard, agreement can be time consuming. Moreover, agreement does not mean that costs are shared: all CSDP missions are *de facto* coalitions of those willing to give donations and volunteers. To solidify support, the missions are often done on the cheap; PR is seldom a priority. As a result, the member states that participate use their well-established press offices to take the credit, sometimes at the expense of the EU.

Logistically, it is expensive and dangerous for international and European journalists to cover the missions as they are, by definition, in the middle of a crisis and often, quite remote. The local press in the region is usually not very active because the crisis has curtailed freedom of press, or it was not very well developed in the first place, or both. In addition, the Brussels-based press officer may not speak the local language making interaction with local journalists difficult.

4.1 Secrecy + Low Profile = Poor Public Relations Opportunities

The origins of the EU's Aceh mission are a perfect example of the need for secrecy in getting a crisis management mission off the ground. Peace had been elusive for decades, but a chance encounter with Finnish national Juha Christensen put the settlement on track. Christensen and his wife received posts as international language researchers sent to Sulawesi, an island in Indonesia, with the goal of charting the over 100 regional languages. In doing so, he learned Behasa Indonesia fluently and made life-long friendships.

In the late 1990s, he became interested in Aceh, and, as luck would have it, met Farid Husain, Deputy Minister for Social Affairs. Husain was known for his role in settling earlier crises on other islands, and in a subsequent meeting in 2003, Christensen told him that he had contacts with the Free Aceh Movement (GAM), the Acehnese rebel group in Stockholm. In this discussion, former Finnish President Martti Ahtisaari's name was first raised as a possible mediator. What Christensen did not know was that Jusuf Kalla, Indonesia's Vice President, had charged Husain with the secret task of making new contacts with the GAM leadership in Sweden. The Government of Indonesia was open to peace negotiations, but with stories of human rights abuses and a legacy of failed talks, it did not want to make its overtures public (Merikallio 2008 : 28-29). The issue was too politically sensitive.

The political sensitivity meant that the negotiations required secrecy. Merikallio has several photos of members of the GAM and the Government of Indonesia (GoI) standing in the snow, in January 2005, while partaking in closed negotiations at the Koeningstedt Manor in Vantaa, Finland. When asked why the talks took place in Finland, Ahtisaari answered, "it was necessary that the parties be isolated from the press." He explained the situation as mutually exclusive: "Both mediation team and parties had a choice – be nice to the press or work to try to solve real problems and find an agreement (Aguswandi/Large 2008: 23). Only Ahtisaari spoke to the press, and only to say that the two sides were meeting. Ahtisaari explained: "There is always a great temptation for the parties to use the media in the negotiations. But if we start to announce via the media that we have demanded this or that of the other party, finding a solution will become ever more difficult" (Merikallio 2008: 22).

It was at this time that the EU was raised as a possible monitor for any peace agreement. The fact that the exiled GAM leaders were also naturalized Swedish citizens made the EU involved. Yet, these negotiations had to occur behind closed doors; they could not have succeeded in the public eye. Therefore, there could be no build up in the press of the EU's involvement in the mission. Any possibility of EU promotion was lost.

Keeping a low profile was conducive to a successful operation. Such was the lesson learned in the Council document of 2008 that drew on the Aceh experience. Recognizing the sensitive political environment and that the "mere deployment of such missions can sometimes trigger political reactions and/or create expectations", crisis missions must be planned in a confidential manner, to the point that transparency "may have to be sacrificed, at least in the early stages" (Council of the European Union 2009). Using CSDP missions to promote the EU could very well compromise the success of the missions themselves; the EU cannot be seen to take too much credit for the peace process. As Ahtisaari explained: "That is why I always praise the parties for the fact that this is an agreement between them. Nobody wants to be reminded afterwards that an outsider was needed to take care of their affairs. I learned that already in Namibia" (as cited in Merikallio 2008 : 141).

4.2 Institutional Constraints: Member States Take the Glory

All CSDP missions are politically sensitive by definition, if for no other reason than that all the EU member states have different national interests. The Treaty on European Union sets out very clear decision making procedures with the perhaps contradictory goal of speaking with a common voice on international events, while at the same time, not forcing a national capital's hand. As a result, all foreign and security policy decision making is characterized by diplomatic negotiations behind closed doors guided by specific processes to ensure no government will be publicly embarrassed or put under public pressure to change its policy. The press is not allowed in. Instead, once a decision is made, the PSC negotiates the wording of a press release to make sure all the nuances carefully wrought from the closed-door deliberations are properly conveyed in the media.

European Parliament President Martin Schulz attributed the lack of positive media coverage to such secrecy: "Why do EU institutions meet behind closed doors [sic]. Everything that happens behind closed

doors is anonymous and leaves open great room for interpretation." He suggested this only prolongs the practice of member states blaming the EU when things go wrong and taking credit for positive developments (Mahony 2013). Christoph Meyer made a similar observation in 1999 noting that the EU's communication deficit is used by member states to shift blame to the EU (Meyer 1999).

In her work on European public diplomacy, Mai'a Davis Cross argued that member states are to blame for the low level of EU foreign policy exposure "because national-level public diplomacy rarely includes the EU in its messages to foreign publics" (Davis Cross 2011). Why is this the case? With regard to CSDP missions, it is because member states bear almost all the risks, and so take the lion's share of the 'profits', that is the credit when a mission is successful. Most missions have a lead country, and that lead country will often coordinate press coverage at home using the government's large and sophisticated press office. In contrast, CSDP missions must manage on their own with very few people. Significantly, since the first CSDP mission, the number of press officers, even today, has never exceeded four people.

Initially, there was no funding for press relations. In 2003, a few months into the first CSDP mission, EUPM Bosnia, the police mission, a German journalist knocked on the door of the headquarters and asked to speak with the press officer. When told the mission had none, the journalist volunteered and took the post.[10] It would be another four years until there was audio-visual for Council missions.[11] Traditionally, the Council secretariat had no communication budget because there was no need: the member states each had their own press team, and the Council did not implement policy like the Commission or debate it like the Parliament. However, Solana recognized that alongside the greater responsibility of running CSDP missions came the responsibility of explaining the missions to the public. Nevertheless, getting a line item for communication in the budget was problematic. PRINCE (Information Programme for EU Citizens) funding was for Commission projects; member states already had their own teams. Solana's press team was composed of one spokesperson and three officers, a total of four people.

Solana found a way to build a communications budget into each joint action, alongside funding for transportation and supplies. When asking member states for personnel, some states would volunteer press officers, usually for a total of three. These three people would have no previous knowledge of either each other or the mission, and would have to be trained by Solana's press team in Brussels[12].

With so few funds, public relations was mostly an afterthought. The Council sent just one press officer to Aceh. Not only did he have to put all his costs, flight, hotel, etc., on his personal credit card until the official agreement and budget could be signed, but once he arrived, there was no office, and therefore no office equipment. In the beginning, the EU subsisted on a shared computer and photocopier, and on the local World Bank office to check email. [13]

10 Interview with External Action Service official, 6 October 2011, Brussels, Belgium.

11 Interview with EU official III, 11 October 2011, Brussels, Belgium.

12 Interview with EU official I, 3 October 2011, Brussels, Belgium.

13 Interview with External Action Service official II, 7 October 2011, Brussels, Belgium

Luckily for the mission, there was more press interest than initially expected because the tsunami had brought many reporters to Indonesia. While reporting on the recovery and rebuilding efforts, many journalists found out about the peace agreement and wanted to cover it at the same time.

However, the press coverage could embarrass the parties involved as well. In many developing countries, where the majority of missions take place, the press is often not free. For example, foreign journalists and researchers require a special visa and approval of the topic ahead of time before entering Indonesia. To quote a retired General in Jakarta: "[Foreigners] take video pictures and speak unpleasant news around the province. The army's job is to guarantee unity of Indonesia and we are willing to do everything to make sure of that" (Merikallio 2008: 68). Allowing in outsiders was a great risk for the government, but the government had little choice considering that so many foreigners and foreign journalists had already entered the country either to aid or to cover the tsunami.

4.3 Logistics: Location, Location, Location, and Timing

The remoteness of the CSDP operations also hindered international and European media coverage. Very simply, it is difficult for a journalist to get to the mission to report on it. For example, for the anti-piracy mission, Operation Atalanta, off the coast of Somalia, a journalist would have to fly to Djibouti, a very expensive and time consuming itinerary, and, even if he or she did manage to get in touch with the naval ships in the Gulf of Aden, a very big 'if' considering the poor transportation infrastructure, the fact that the ships were at sea, the limited government in the region as well as piracy, there were no satellites available to get the story back to Europe. With limited budgets and limited time, journalists often choose to direct their energies elsewhere. Moreover, back home at military headquarters (HQ) in Norwood, England, the HQ had no desire to do media relations, especially considering that the headquarters was a secure building for guarding military secrets. However, Whitehall stepped in and insisted they speak to the press.[14]

Using EUFOR Tchad as another example, French Foreign Minister Bernard Kouchner sent his own press team accompanied by journalists, and paid for all their expenses. *Par contre*, Solana's press officer had to find the money to take a commercial flight to N'Djamena and then find a helicopter to take her to Farchana, Abéché. EU publicity was not the primary goal of the French foreign ministry. Luckily, in that case, the head of mission was a telegenic Irishman who understood the importance of the media, especially in relations with Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), which was of extreme importance in the Chad mission. Solana's office did pay to send journalists down a second time, but, although done all the time, it does bring up some ethical issues.

The Council secretariat had its own strategy to get around the logistics issue. In 2007, they started sending in their own audio-visual teams to make footage for television broadcasts, always being sure to film soldiers speaking in their own language – Dutch, Danish, etc.-, and not the more widely spoken languages of English or French. The goal was to provide attractive footage for the local and national market. They would

14 Interview with EU official I, 3 October 2011, Brussels, Belgium

then call up national newspapers and say "Did you know there were Dutch soldiers in this CSDP mission?" Making the local connections was the only way to get on the news.[15]

With regard to the local media, in general, the missions get little press coverage for several reasons. First, very often, the crisis itself precludes the normal functioning of a local media. In other cases, the press is not free. Another issue is language: depending upon the region, there may not be people in the EU press office who speak the appropriate language to give interviews or to follow the local press coverage. The EU tries to send people with the pertinent linguistic skills, but sometimes it is not possible. In Aceh, the Brussels press officer was lucky that the UK embassy in Jakarta sent over a press officer, an Indonesian national named Faye Belnis, who could speak to local journalists in Behasa Indonesia. The Brussels-based press officer gave out statements in English.

Timing is also an issue. To quote Andy Warhol, everyone has his fifteen minutes of fame, that is, publicity has a limited window of opportunity. In general, crisis missions are most interesting for the first month; after that, they are old news. The same held for the Aceh Mission. The first phase of decommissioning of weapons happened from 15-17 September 2005 when 243 weapons were turned in by GAM and approved by the Aceh Monitoring Mission (AMM) (AMM 2005). As one official described it, it was incredibly busy with over 100 interviews given out and photos taken.[16] Then, the news moment was over, the photo ops of rebels handing over guns were gone. The seconded German diplomat went back to the Jakarta embassy after three weeks, and the journalists went home.[17]

5. Conclusions: Successful Missions Require a Low Profile

In a briefing paper for the EU and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) before the deployment of the AMM, Amnesty International welcomed one of the goals of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) in section 5.2 (d) to "monitor the human rights situation and provide assistance in this field" (Amnesty International 2005). It exhorted the monitors to document any violations or breaches. In the end, no truth and reconciliation tribunal was established, and human rights was pushed to the back burner, but perhaps for the best. Schulze explains that the EU's "lack of focus on implementing the human rights elements […] made it possible for the AMM to complete its mission in the sensitive context of Indonesia domestic politics," and ascribes it as a "lesson learned" (Schulze 2007: 1).

Justin Davies, Chief of Staff of the Monitoring Mission attributes AMM's success to the principle of local ownership:

> *AMM was a peacekeeping operation and the deployment of foreign monitors or missions is always a sensitive issue for a host country. Most of all, a successful peace process needs to be owned by the*

15 EU officials I and III corroborated this point.

16 Interview with Andre Scholz, German Foreign Ministry, email correspondence, 5 June 2012.

17 Interview with EAS official II in, 7 October 2011, Brussels, Belgium.

> *parties and the population concerned, not by foreign bodies. This concept of local ownership is a guiding principle of ESDP and one of great importance to AMM (Davies 2010: 383).*

Juha Christensen, the man who initiated the peace talks, believes in the importance of confidentiality to the peace process. He subsequently founded an NGO, PACTA, that highlights the value of private diplomacy: PACTA's approach is based on "confidentiality whenever necessary, transparency whenever possible" (PACTA 2010).

These three principles: sensitivity to the political situation; local ownership of the peace process, and confidentiality are key to a successful crisis management mission. All of these lessons learned focus on the need for the EU to be flexible, work in a secret environment, even to the point of sacrificing transparency, and keeping a low profile, if peace building is to succeed. In other words, EU self-promotion is at odds with successful crisis management.

The EU is in a bind because Laeken Presidency conclusions asserted, rather melodramatically, that in order to bring the EU closer to its citizens, "the role it has to play is that of a power resolutely doing battle against all violence, all terror, and all fanaticism, but which also does not turn a blind eye to the world's heart-rending injustices" (European Council 2001: 20). EU expeditions provide an opportunity for the EU to be 'seen' internationally; they also provide an opportunity for the citizen to become wrapped up in the human element of the story as well. Moral justice plays a large role in the formation of a protagonist in the creation of a national, or in this case, a European narrative. In other words, the EU must be seen as the 'good cop' in the media and in public statements. As Dan Nimmo and James Combes explained, the news media very often fulfill social and psychological functions more than intellectual or intelligence functions (Nimmo/Combs 1983, as cited in Bloom 1990: 177). Laurent Boussié, Correspondent for France 2 in the UK, noted at a conference hosted by the Strategic Studies Institute, that the "media typically focus on 'sympathy' and 'emotional' issues without much regard for the whole truth" (as cited in Johnson II. 2005). By employing the "melodramatic imperative" in political news, i.e., describing international events as a dramatic story of good versus evil, of us versus them, the news creates an emotive force that can mobilize public opinion. Therefore, the viewer will identify with what is happening to the tourist, company, or diplomat internationally and see it as personally affecting him or herself. Chosen judiciously, the right international event could increase the EU's prestige and therefore enhance its identity (Bloom 1990: 48).

When carefully examined, perhaps one should not be surprised that successful crisis management runs counter to such a policy. If the EU is the 'good' cop, who, in a sensitive political environment, should be labeled the 'bad'? Melodrama may make for good television, but melodrama and crisis management usually create tragedy. Placing the emphasis on the success of the mission is the right lesson learned.

Nevertheless, the European Union may not be able to continue its good work without being visible. The European taxpayer may balk at paying for such missions if he or she remains in the dark as to the good it does. Although European public opinion strongly supports a CSDP in general, the devil is in the details. Public support for an ESDP drops significantly once asked whether they are willing to pay for it. In 2004, although 71 percent of Europeans wanted the EU to become a superpower like the U.S., 47 percent of the 71 percent withdrew their support if that ambition meant an increase in military spending (German

Marshall Fund of the United States 2004). In other words, the people want the prestige of an EU force, but not the cost.

The people may balk at the social cost as well. In its Long Term Vision, the European Defense Agency warned that finding public support for missions may become more and more difficult: "Governments and societies increasingly concerned for internal security and social cohesion may be even more hesitant to undertake potentially controversial interventions abroad – in particular interventions in regions from where large numbers of immigrants have come" (European Defence Agency 2006).

Under these circumstances, one can understand why the EU and its member states have called for higher visibility for CSDP missions, but little can be done. Diplomacy is by definition the art of dealing with people in a sensitive and effective way. Tooting the EU's horn at home might do some good, but it will not in navigating a crisis. In any case, institutionally, the EU – as well as any organization – has little wiggle room: the member states who make the sacrifice want the credit.

Understanding the reasons behind this failure, whether it is a question of agency, that is whether the EU would be able to fix the problem by changing procedure, or whether it is structural, that is, intrinsic in the missions themselves, is vital to addressing the EU's foreign policy goals. This paper concludes that the problem is structural: CSDP missions are poor vehicles for EU promotion because of political, institutional, and logistical reasons. If these missions inherently cannot fulfill their visibility function, the EU may want to rethink whether such risky ventures are still worthwhile.

References

Aceh Monitoring Mission (AMM) 2005: First phase of re-location and decommissioning completed. Press Release, 27 September 2005, in: http://www.aceh-mm.org/download/english/Decomm%20Phase%20I.pdf, retrieved October 1, 2013.

Agence Europe 2005: UE/Defence: Progress expected in military capabilities field, in: Europe Daily Bulletin, May 24, 2005.

Aguswandi/Large, Judith (eds) 2008: Reconfiguring politics: The Indonesia-Aceh peace process, in: Accord: an international review of peace initiatives 20, London: Conciliation Resources.

Amnesty International 2005: A briefing for EU and ASEAN countries concerning the deployment of the Aceh Monitoring Mission to Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam Province, ASA 21/017&2005, in: http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/ASA21/017/2005/en/2716e4ce-d4af-11dd-8a23-d58a49c0d652/asa210172005en.pdf, retrieved October 1, 2013.

Anderson, Stephanie 2008: Crafting EU Security Policy: In Pursuit of European Identity, Boulder, CO: Lynne Reiner.

Assembly of the Western European Union 2006a: Rapporteur on "Public Opinion and the Althea Mission" visiting Sarajevo notes lack of public awareness of ESDP, Paris, April 4, 2006.

Assembly of the Western European Union 2006b: Althea – a symbol of the ESDP success, WEU Assembly press release, Paris, June 20, 2006.

Bernstein, Richard 2005: Europe is Still Europe, in: New York Times, June 7, 2005.

Blockmans, Steven/Wouters, Jan/Ruys, Tom (eds.) 2010: The European Union and Peacebuilding: Policy and Legal Aspects, The Hague: TMC Asser Press.

Bloom, William 1990: Personal Identity, National Identity, and International Relations, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, Joshua 2009: Same Protocol, More Options for News Publishers, in: Google News Blog, December 2, 2009, in: http://googlenewsblog.blogspot.de/2009/12/same-protocol-more-options-for-news.html, retrieved October 1, 2013.

Council of the European Union 2003: Concept for EU Monitoring missions, in: http://www.eulex-kosovo.eu/training/material/docs/esdp/consilium/Concept_for_EU_Monitoring_missions.pdf, retrieved October 1, 2013.

Council of the European Union 2008: Report on the Implementation of the European Security Strategy – Providing Security in a Changing World, S407/08, December 11, 2008, in: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/reports/104630.pdf, retrieved October 1, 2013.

Council of the European Union 2009: Draft Review of Recommendations for Enhancing Co-operation with Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) in the Framework of EU Civilian Crisis Management and Conflict Prevention, 10114/108, in: http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/08/st10/st10114-re01.en08.pdf, retrieved October 1, 2013.

Council of the European Union 2010: Draft Council decision establishing the organization and functioning of the European External Action Service, 8029/10, March 25, 2010, in: http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/10/st08/st08029.en10.pdf, retrieved October 1, 2013.

Davies, Justin 2010: The Aceh Monitoring Mission: Securing Peace and Democracy, in: Blockmans, Steven/Wouters, Jan/Ruys, Tom (eds): The European Union and Peacebuilding: Policy and Legal Aspects, The Hague: TMC Asser Press, 375-386.

Davis Cross, Mai'a K. 2011: EU Public Diplomacy: A Coherent Message? Paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, Montreal, Canada.

De Vreese, Claes H./Boomgaarden, Hajo G. 2006: Media Effects on Public Opinion about the Enlargement of the European Union, in: Journal of Common Market Studies 44/2, 419-436.

European Council 2001: Presidency Conclusions – European Council Meeting in Laeken, 14 and 25 December 2001, S300/1/01 in: http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/background/docs/laeken_concl_en.pdf, retrieved October 1, 2013.

European Council 2012: European Council 13/14 December 2012 – Conclusions, in: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/134353.pdf, retrieved October 1, 2013.

European Defence Agency 2006: An Initial Long-Term Vision for European Defence Capability and Capacity Needs, in: http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/reports/91135.pdf, retrieved October 1, 2013.

Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom (FCO) 1998: Joint Declaration issued at the British-French Summit, Saint-Malo, 3-4 December 1998, in: http://www.cvce.eu/obj/franco_british_st_malo_declaration_4_december_1998-en-f3cd16fb-fc37-4d52-936f-c8e9bc80f24f.html, retrieved October 1, 2013.

German Marshall Fund of the United States 2004: Transatlantic Survey Shows Continued, Significant Split in U.S.-Europe Relations, Press Release, September 9, 2004, in: http://www.gmfus.org/archives/transatlantic-survey-shows-continued-significant-split-in-u-s-europe-relations/, retrieved October 1, 2013.

Johnson II., Douglas V. 2005: The Test of Terrain: The Impact of Stability Operations upon the Armed Forces, in: Strategic Studies Institute, Conference on the Impact of Stability Operations Upon the Armed Forces, 16-18 June 2010, Paris, in: http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/download.cfm?q=714, retrieved October 1, 2013.

Luxembourg Presidency of the Council of the European Union 2005: Working document relating to point 5 of the agenda: Presidency non-paper - Promoting the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP), March 11, 2005, in: http://www.eu2005.lu/en/actualites/documents_travail/2005/03/18definfo/index.html, retrieved October 1, 2013.

Mahony, Honor 2013: Parliament chief: 'the EU is not in a good state', in: EUobserver.com, January 25, 2013, in: euobserver.com/political/118856, retrieved October 1, 2013.

Merikallio, Katri 2008: Making peace: Ahtisaari and Aceh, Helsinki: WS Bookwell Oy.

Meyer, Christoph 1999: Political Legitimacy and the Invisibility of Politics: Exploring the European Union's Communication Deficit, in: Journal of Common Market Studies 37/4, 617-639.

Nimmo, Dan D./Combs, James E. 1983: Mediated Political Realities, New York: Longman.

Pacta 2010: Mission and Strategy, in: http://www.pacta.fi/mission, retrieved October 1, 2013.

Rettman, Andrew 2010: EU commission justifies Haiti visibility concerns, in: EUobserver.com, January 28, 2010, in: http://euobserver.com/political/29360, retrieved October 1, 2013.

Schulze, Kirsten E. 2007: Mission Not So Impossible. The Aceh Monitoring Mission and Lessons learned for the EU, in: International Policy Analysis, http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/id/04786.pdf, retrieved October 1, 2013.

Spokesperson of the Secretary General, High Representative for CFSP 2007: Summary of Remarks to the Press by Javier Solana, EU High Representative for the CFSP, at a joint press briefing with UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, Brussels, January 24, 2007, S022/07, in: http://www.wien-io.diplo.de/contentblob/1550812/Daten/78616/BanEU_downloaddatei.pdf, retrieved October 1, 2013.

Sturm, Paul 2010: Shoring up the EU's Public Diplomacy in CSDP, in: European Security Review 52, November 2010, in: http://www.isis-europe.eu/sites/default/files/programmes-downloads/2010_artrel_581_esr52-pd-in-csdp.pdf, retrieved October 1, 2013.

The Kolleg-Forschergruppe - Encouraging Academic Exchange and Intensive Research

The Kolleg-Forschergruppe (KFG) is a new funding programme launched by the German Research Foundation in 2008. It is a centrepiece of the KFG to provide a scientifically stimulating environment in which innovative research topics can be dealt with by discourse and debate within a small group of senior and junior researchers.

The Kolleg-Forschergruppe „The Transformative Power of Europe" brings together research on European affairs in the Berlin-Brandenburg region and institutionalizes the cooperation with other universities and research institutions. It examines the role of the EU as promoter and recipient of ideas, analyzing the mechanisms and effects of internal and external diffusion processes in three research areas:

- Identity and the Public Sphere
- Compliance, Conditionality and Beyond
- Comparative Regionalism and Europe's External Relations

KFG The Transformative Power of Europe